

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was *not* written
2 for publication and is *not* binding precedent of the Board

3
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5
6
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8 AND INTERFERENCES

9
10
11 *Ex parte* CARL P. PEARSON

12
13
14 Appeal 2007-0754
15 Application 09/669,087
16 Technology Center 3700

17
18
19 Decided: March 30, 2007

20
21
22 *Before* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, STUART S. LEVY, and LINDA E.
23 HORNER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

24
25 LEVY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

26
27
28 DECISION ON APPEAL

29
30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection
32 of claims 1-28. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

33 Appellant invented a video game system using trading cards.
34 (Specification 3). A video game features characters on the trading cards. A
35 control system carrying out the game controls a screen in accordance with a

1 software program and in accordance with the character information
2 associated with the trading cards selected by the players of the game.

3 Claim 1 is representative of the claims on appeal and reads as follows:

4 1. A video game system using trading cards,
5 comprising:

6
7 a local electronic game system for use with a video
8 screen for displaying the playing of a selected video game featuring
9 characters on trading cards, the characters having associated character
10 information, including characteristics which define the playing of the
11 game, the electronic game system including a control system for
12 carrying out the video game and controlling the display on the screen
13 in accordance with a stored software program and in accordance with
14 the character information associated with the trading cards selected by
15 the players of the game for use in the game;

16
17 trading cards having characters indicated thereon for
18 playing the video game;

19
20 an identification system for identifying the trading cards
21 selected by players for playing the video game;

22
23 a server control unit for connecting the local electronic
24 game system to a website at a remote location through a global
25 computer network; and

26
27 a processing system at the website for verifying that the
28 players of the video game have the right to use the selected trading
29 cars in the playing of the selected video game, wherein the website
30 includes means for storing information associated with the characters
31 on said trading cards and for downloading said information to the
32 video game control system, which includes means for receiving said
33 downloaded information and which is capable of using said
34 downloaded information and said associated character information
35 from the trading cards to carry out the video game after the selected

1 trading cards have been identified and the player's rights to use the
2 selected trading cards have been verified.

3
4 The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2004)
5 as being unpatentable over Peppel in view of Sehr and Pearson.

6 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on
7 appeal is:

8	Pearson	US 5,411,259	May 2, 1995
9	Peppel	US 6,200,216 B1	Mar. 13, 2001
10	Sehr	US 6,325,292 B1	Dec. 4, 2001

11
12 With respect to claims 1-22, Appellant contends (Br. 3-4) that Peppel
13 does not teach that the information stored on the remote website associated
14 with a character on a selected trading card is "downloaded directly into the
15 control system of the local electronic game system." Appellant states that
16 "[t]he character information used in Peppel [sic, Peppel] for carrying out the
17 video game comes into play only from the medium of the ETCs themselves
18 (the trading cards)," whereas Appellant's system is capable of using both
19 downloaded information from a website and information on a trading card to
20 carry out the game. (*Id.*). Appellant contends (*id.*) that Sehr does not teach
21 this feature. Appellant further contends (Br. 3-4) that there is no teaching in
22 Peppel of verifying that individual players have the right to use the trading
23 card selected by the player for playing the video game. With respect to
24 claims 23-28 Appellant contends the he has claimed a single, stand-alone
25 configuration of a video game using trading cards, and that the Examiner has
26 not cited any reference which discloses or suggests any such arrangement.
27 (Br. 5-6).

1 The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine Peppel
2 with the security and authentication programs of Sehr and the media
3 structure of Pearson (Answer 5). The motivation provided by the Examiner
4 is that Peppel states that his system is for disassociated consumer media; i.e.,
5 multimedia products that allow customers to browse, create, collect, and
6 exchange, as well as play games (Answer 4).

7
8 We AFFIRM-IN-PART.

9
10 ISSUE

11 Has Appellant shown that the Examiner erred in holding that the
12 combined teachings and suggestions of Peppel, Sehr, and Pearson would
13 have suggested to an artisan the invention of claims 1-28? With respect to
14 claims 1-22, the issue turns on whether the references teach or suggest
15 verifying that the players have the right to use the selected trading card in
16 the playing of the video game, and whether the prior art teaches or suggests
17 that the website includes means for downloading information associated
18 with the characters on the trading cards to the video game control system, as
19 required by claim 1. With regard to claims 23-28, the issue turns on whether
20 the prior art would have suggested combining the electronic game system,
21 video screen, and trading card reader into a "single, stand-alone unit."

22
23 FINDINGS OF FACT

24 Based upon a preponderance of the evidence, we make the following
25 findings of fact:

- 1 1. Appellant invented a video game system using characters
2 featured on trading cards. A control system carries out the
3 game in accordance with a stored software program and in
4 accordance with the character information associated with
5 the trading cards selected by the players of the game for use
6 in the game. A website stores information associated with
7 the characters in said trading cards and downloads the
8 information to the video game control system, after the
9 trading cards have been identified and verified, for playing
10 the video game. (Specification 3).
- 11 2. Peppel is directed to an electronic trading card. (Peppel, col.
12 1, l.1).
- 13 3. The invention of Peppel provides electronic hardware and
14 software architecture for electronic trading cards (ETCs).
15 (Peppel, col. 4, ll. 50-52).
- 16 4. Peppel discloses that the components function together as a
17 system that supports activities such as game playing with
18 electronic trading cards. (Peppel, col. 4, ll. 51-58).
- 19 5. Peppel discloses that single or multiple ETCs may be copied
20 onto writable media. (Peppel, col. 8, ll. 60-61).
- 21 6. ETC adventure games are similar in structure to existing
22 video and computer games except that the ETCs move the
23 action forward and can generate ETCs in the course of a
24 game. (Peppel, col. 10, l. 66-col. 11, l. 3).

- 1 7. Sehr is directed to a card system and methods utilizing
2 collector cards. (Sehr, col. 1, ll. 1-2).
- 3 8. Sehr discloses that the cardholder can exchange data with
4 remote databases, as well as update or manipulate data
5 stored in the card. (Sehr, col. 3, ll. 42-47).
- 6 9. Collector card 11 of Sehr comprises a handheld card device
7 that is used by the cardholder to store collectible
8 information, request various services, and pay for the
9 purchase of goods and services. The collector card includes
10 smart cards that have the shape of credit cards and have an
11 embedded circuit. The collector cards can further include
12 handheld terminals or any pocket-sized computer
13 configurations. The embedded circuits give the cards
14 database storage means, processing means and display
15 means. Card data can be retrieved or loaded into the card by
16 a card read/write device. (Sehr, col. 5, ll. 43-59).
- 17 10. In Sehr, biometrics are used to verify if a cardholder is
18 legitimate. (Sehr, col. 6, ll. 15-17).
- 19 11. The database of Sehr includes the cardholder identification
20 number. (Sehr, col. 7, ll. 13-16).
- 21 12. Full-motion video segments can be retrieved and stored in
22 the card. (Sehr, col. 10, ll. 23-25).
- 23 13. The method of Sehr includes verifying the identity of the
24 cardholder. (Sehr, col. 11, ll. 66-67).

1 14. To ensure that the cardholder in Sehr is entitled to receive
2 the requested service, the identity of the cardholder can be
3 verified. (Sehr, col. 16, l. 66-col. 17, l. 1).

4 15. Pearson is directed to a video sports game system using
5 trading cards. (Pearson, col. 1, ll. 1-2).

6 16. In Pearson, trading card elements have input data stored
7 thereon concerning performance information of players in
8 the video game. The information can be read by a card
9 reader. (Pearson, col. 1, ll. 61-64).

10 17. As shown in figure 1 of Pearson, the monitor 14, card reader
11 22, and control system 12 are separate elements.

12
13
14 PRINCIPLES OF LAW

15 On appeal, Appellant bears the burden of showing that the Examiner
16 has not established a legally sufficient basis for combining the teachings of
17 the applied prior art. Appellant may sustain this burden by showing that,
18 where the Examiner relies on a combination of disclosures, the Examiner
19 failed to provide sufficient evidence to show that one having ordinary skill
20 in the art would have done what Appellant did. *United States v. Adams*, 383
21 U.S. 39, 48, 148 USPQ 479, 482 (1966); *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 987-88,
22 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co.*
23 *Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick, Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1360-61, 80 USPQ2d
24 1641, 1645 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The mere fact that all the claimed elements or
25 steps appear in the prior art is not per se sufficient to establish that it would
26 have been obvious to combine those elements. *United States v. Adams, id*;

1 *Smith Indus. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Vital Signs, Inc.*, 183 F.3d 1347, 1356, 51
2 USPQ2d 1415, 1420 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

3 ANALYSIS

4 We begin with claims 1-22. Appellant argues these claims as a group.
5 Accordingly, we select claim 1 as representative of the group. We note at
6 the outset that Appellant does not dispute the combinability of the
7 references, but rather argues to the effect that the combined teachings of the
8 prior art would not result in the claimed invention. From facts 13 and 14 we
9 find that Sehr suggests verifying the identity of the cardholder, as well as
10 verifying that the cardholder is entitled to receive the requested service.
11 However, although Sehr describes downloading full motion video segments
12 that can be retrieved and stored in the card (fact 12), we find no disclosure in
13 Sehr of using the trading cards with video games, and no teaching of this has
14 been pointed to by the Examiner. Nor do we find in Sehr any teaching or
15 suggestion of downloading from a website any information to a video game
16 control system.

17 With respect to Peppel and Pearson, although these references are
18 directed to trading cards used with video games, we find no teaching or
19 suggestion in either reference of downloading from the processing system at
20 the website information associated with the characters on the trading cards,
21 to the video game control system. The Examiner has not pointed to any
22 description in the applied prior art for this claimed feature. In response to
23 Appellant's assertion (Br. 4-5) that this feature is not suggested, the
24 Examiner's response (Answer 7) is that Peppel teaches media and platform
25 independence, and refers to columns 3-5 of Sehr for a teaching of updating a

1 card through a remote database. Firstly, the Examiner's broad reference to
2 columns (instead of col./line) of the reference is not helpful to us in deciding
3 this appeal. Secondly, a description of media and platform independence
4 does not address downloading to the video game control system. Thirdly,
5 the fact the Sehr describes downloading to the card is not a description or
6 suggestion of downloading to the video game control system, because the
7 claims require downloading to the video game control system, not to the
8 trading card.

9 From all of the above, we agree with Appellant that the teachings and
10 suggestions of the prior art fall short of suggesting all of the limitations of
11 claim 1. It follows that we cannot sustain the rejection of claims 1-22.

12 We turn next to claims 23-28. Appellant's arguments are directed to
13 claim 23. Accordingly, we select claim 23 as representative of the group.
14 From fact 9, we find a description in Sehr of the card being a handheld
15 computing device. However, we find no description in Sehr that the card
16 read/write device will be part of the handheld device. However, claim 23 is
17 not specific as to how the components of the game system, display and card
18 reader are integrated into a single, stand-alone unit. In the absence of
19 solving any problem in the art or the recitation of any unobvious structure,
20 we find that to make integral, or in one piece that which was known to be
21 made in plural pieces would have been obvious to an artisan. *See In re*
22 *Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965).

23 Accordingly, we find that to make the card reader, display and game system
24 as a single, stand-alone unit, would have been within the level of ordinary
25 skill of an artisan. It follows that we are not convinced of any error on the

1 part of the Examiner in rejecting claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
2 unpatentable over the teachings and suggestions of Peppel, Sehr, and
3 Pearson. The rejection of claims 23-28 is sustained.

4
5 **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

6 Appellant has met his burden of establishing that the Examiner erred
7 in rejecting claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Appellant has not met his
8 burden of showing the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 23-28 under 35
9 U.S.C. § 103(a).

10
11 **DECISION**

12 The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-22 is reversed. The Examiner's
13 rejection of claims 23-28 is affirmed.

14 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with
15 this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2006).

16 **AFFIRMED-IN-PART**

17
18
19
20
21 hh

22
23 *JENSEN + PUNTIGAM, P.S.*
24 *SUITE 1020*
25 *2033 6TH AVE*
26 *SEATTLE WA 98121*